REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2 and 8-12 are amended. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 7-12 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claims 1, 8, 9, and 12 are amended to recite, respectively, a device, a method, and a computer-readable program storing the method, using claim 1 as an example, "entering a character string into a plurality of character string processing devices, comprising:. . . allowing a user to enter the character string to be entered into the plurality of character string processing devices; . . . acquiring a situation peculiar to current input processing among a plurality of situations of at least one of the character string processing devices that has been started or an activated program on at least one of the character string processing devices from the at least one of the character string processing devices or the activated program into which the character string is given." (See, for example, page 10, lines 1-20, and FIG. 1).

Dependent claims 2 and 10-11 are amended accordingly.

No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

ITEMS 5-7: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 5 AND 7-12 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejects independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 12 (and respective dependent claims) under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable by Yang (U.S.P. 6,005,498) in view of combinations of Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. (JP App. Pub. NUMBER *Hei* 7-129572A), Miller et al. (U.S.P. 5,896,321), Canon (JP App. Pub. Number *Hei* 9 (1997)-6771), Bishop (U.S.P. 5,829,023), Hitachi (JP App. Pub. Number Sho 61-32186) and Just Syst (JP App Pub. Number Hei 9-179859).

The rejections are traversed.

As provided in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F. 2d 1981, (CCPA 1974)."

Independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 12, all as amended, recite respectively, a device, a method, and a computer-readable program storing the method, using claim 1 as an example,

"entering a character string into a plurality of character string processing devices, comprising:an input part allowing a user to enter the character string to be entered into the plurality of character string processing devices; an input situation acquiring part for acquiring a situation peculiar to current input processing among a plurality of situations of at least one of the character string processing devices that has been started or an activated program on at least one of the character string processing devices from the at least one of the character string processing devices or the activated program into which the character string is given."

Applicants submit that these features, for example, are not taught by Yang, alone or in an *arguendo* combination with any of the cited art.

The Examiner mistakenly contends that a recited character string processing device according to aspects of the present invention is taught by Yang's "the reduced entry keypad to allow Chinese characters to be efficiently entered." (Action at page 3). The Examiner also contends that "an input situation acquiring part for acquiring a situation peculiar to current input processing among a plurality of situations of a character string processing device that has been started or an activated program" is taught by Yang's teaching "a MENU key that allows the user to select a 'pinyin entry' option." (Action at page 3).

However, the character string processing device according to aspects of the present invention is an apparatus in which a character string is expected to be input, e.g., a schedule inputting device, an electronic mail inputting device, etc. (See, for example, page 10, starting at line 6).

Yang merely teaches that the reduced entry keypad is an input device for a user to input a character string. In the reduced entry keypad as taught by Yang, keys pressed by the user are merely assigned some signals respectively, and "character strings" are not input.

Furthermore, according to aspects of the present invention a input situation acquiring part acquires a situation from a character string processing device or program in which a character string is expected to be input.

Yang merely teaches a MENU key that allows the user to select a pinyin entry option and obtains information from a selective input (key input) from the user. That is, Yang does not teach acquiring a situation from a character string, but only from another source.

Summary

Since features recited by claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-12 are not taught by the cited art and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejections should be withdrawn and claims 1, 2, 5, and

7

7-12 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _Aug 29, 2001_   By: _____

                                   Paul W. Bobowiec
                                   Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501